

Andrew C. Lauersdorf, WSBA #35418  
E-mail: acl@mlrlegalteam.com  
Janis C. Puracal, WSBA #39234  
E-mail: jcp@mlrlegalteam.com  
MALONEY LAUERSDORF REINER, PC  
1111 E. Burnside St., Ste. 300  
Portland, OR 97214  
Telephone: (503) 245-1518  
Facsimile: (503) 245-1417  
Attorneys for Plaintiff Perienne de Jaray

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

PERIENNE DE JARAY,

Plaintiff,

v.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA  
FOR HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN,  
CANADIAN BORDER SERVICES  
AGENCY, GLOBAL AFFAIRS CANADA  
fka DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN  
AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL  
TRADE CANADA, GEORGE WEBB,  
KEVIN VARGA, and PATRICK LISKA,

Defendants.

No.: 2:16-cv-00571

PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME  
TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION TO DISMISS

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR EXTENSION**

Defendants have taken an unreasonable position. There is no good reason to oppose an extension of time so that the parties and the Court can fairly address the need for discovery.

Plaintiff first attempted to seek discovery in advance of Defendants' motion to dismiss,<sup>1</sup> and Defendants opposed that attempt, arguing that the

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's Motion for FRCP 16 Status Conference and Permission to Engage in

1 motion was premature.<sup>2</sup> Defendants insisted that Plaintiff wait until the  
 2 motion to dismiss was filed before requesting discovery.<sup>3</sup> They also refused to  
 3 disclose the factual basis for the motion on grounds of work product.<sup>4</sup>  
 4 Defendants wrote in their opposition to the earlier motion for discovery: “The  
 5 Court should deny the motion [for discovery], with leave for plaintiff to refile  
 6 once Defendants have filed their motions to dismiss, if plaintiff can properly  
 7 identify and adequately support the relief she requests.”<sup>5</sup> They also wrote:  
 8 “Plaintiff should wait to see defendants’ motions to dismiss and then articulate  
 9 what discovery is appropriate, if any[.]”<sup>6</sup> They further wrote: “The time to  
 10 consider any discovery issues pertaining to that briefing [on the motion to  
 11 dismiss] is after the briefs are filed, and plaintiff can articulate what she needs  
 12 and why it is appropriate.”<sup>7</sup>

13 The Court denied Plaintiff’s request for discovery, but instructed Plaintiff  
 14 to “move at a later date to request that discovery and an extension of the  
 15 deadline to respond to the Rule 12 motions.”<sup>8</sup>

16 Plaintiff followed the Defendants’ proposal and the Court’s instruction.  
 17 Within one week after the Rule 12 motion was filed, Plaintiff moved for the  
 18 extension. She also began preparing her motion for discovery and the

---

19 Discovery in FRCP 26(f) [Dkt. No. 15].

20 <sup>2</sup> Defendants’ Opposition to Motion to Set FRCP 16 Conference and to Open Discovery  
 21 [Dkt. No. 17].

22 <sup>3</sup> *Id.* at pp. 1, 8, 9.

23 <sup>4</sup> *Id.* at p. 9.

24 <sup>5</sup> *Id.* at p. 1.

25 <sup>6</sup> *Id.* at p. 8.

26 <sup>7</sup> *Id.* at p. 9.

<sup>8</sup> Order Denying Plaintiff’s Motion for FRCP 16 Status Conference and Early Discovery  
 at p. 3 [Dkt. No. 21].

1 proposed discovery requests in response to the factual assertions disclosed for  
 2 the first time in Defendants' motion to dismiss. Now, Defendants argue that  
 3 Plaintiff's request for discovery comes too late. Defendants' position is  
 4 unreasonable in light of Plaintiff's earlier attempts to raise this issue with the  
 5 Court.

6 Plaintiff even pointed out in her earlier motion for discovery that she  
 7 would be unable to get a ruling on a motion for discovery in advance of the  
 8 deadline to respond to the motion to dismiss.<sup>9</sup> Defendants insisted that  
 9 Plaintiff nonetheless wait until the motion to dismiss was filed before  
 10 addressing the need for discovery.<sup>10</sup> Now that the motion to dismiss has been  
 11 filed, Defendants assert that Plaintiff is too late in filing her motions seeking  
 12 discovery and an extension of time to respond.

13 Plaintiff also warned Defendants in her earlier motion for discovery that  
 14 the grounds asserted for dismissal raise questions of fact.<sup>11</sup> Case law  
 15 consistently describes *forum non conveniens* as a fact-based inquiry: "[T]he  
 16 district court is accorded substantial flexibility in evaluating a *forum non*  
 17 *conveniens* motion, and each case turns on its facts."<sup>12</sup> Other federal district  
 18

---

19 <sup>9</sup> Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Motion for FRCP 16 Status Conference and Permission  
 20 to Engage in Discovery Under FRCP 26(f) [Dkt. No. 19] at p. 5 (Plaintiff "properly filed  
 21 this motion in advance of Defendants' motions to dismiss because she would be  
 22 unable to note a motion for consideration or get a ruling in advance of her deadline to  
 23 respond to those motions to dismiss.") (citing LR 7(d)(3) and LR 7(j)).

24 <sup>10</sup> Defendants' Opposition to Motion to Set FRCP 16 Conference and to Open Discovery  
 25 [Dkt. No. 17] at pp. 1, 8, 9.

26 <sup>11</sup> Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Motion for FRCP 16 Status Conference and Permission  
 to Engage in Discovery Under FRCP 26(f) [Dkt. No. 19] at p. 5.

<sup>12</sup> *Van Cauwenberghe v. Biard*, 486 U.S. 517, 528, 108 S. Ct. 1945, 100 L.Ed.2d 517  
 (1988). See also *In re Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc., ATX, ATX II and Wilderness Tires*  
*Products Liability Litigation*, 131 F.Supp.2d 1027, 1029 (citing *Van Cauwenberghe*, 486  
 U.S. at 528).

1 courts recognize that “it behooves courts to permit discovery on facts relevant  
 2 to *forum non conveniens* motions.”<sup>13</sup> The Ninth Circuit has reversed a  
 3 dismissal on *forum non conveniens*, noting the trial court had denied the  
 4 plaintiffs the opportunity to conduct limited discovery.<sup>14</sup> The act of state and  
 5 international comity analyses also require a fact-based inquiry.<sup>15</sup> Defendants  
 6 even attempt in their motion to dismiss to rely on facts about the location of  
 7 the wrongful conduct, witnesses, and evidence, albeit without citation or any  
 8 affidavits in support of their factual assertions.<sup>16</sup>

9 Defendants insisted upon filing a motion asserting these grounds for  
 10 relief. Defendants made the choice to file their motion putting these factual  
 11 questions at issue and now assert that the Court should not rule on the  
 12 questions. Defendants have taken a heavy-handed approach to this litigation.  
 13 There is no good reason to oppose Plaintiff’s request for an extension of time to  
 14 respond to Defendants’ motion to dismiss.

15 Plaintiff requests that the Court stay the deadline to respond to  
 16 Defendants’ motion to dismiss so that the Court can fairly consider the issue of  
 17 discovery. Plaintiff has filed her motion for leave to seek discovery, as  
 18 instructed in the Court’s order denying her earlier motion for discovery.  
 19 Plaintiff also attached the discovery she proposes to issue.

## 20 CONCLUSION

21 Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court stay the deadline to respond  
 22 to Defendants’ motion to dismiss so that the Court can fairly consider the issue

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
 24 <sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 1029-30.

25 <sup>14</sup> *Carijano v. Occidental Petroleum Corp.*, 643 F.3d 1216, 1223 (9th Cir. 2011).

26 <sup>15</sup> See Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Seek Discovery at pp. 9-12.

<sup>16</sup> Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss [Dkt. No. 22] at pp. 21-24.

1 of discovery.

2 DATED: October 13, 2016

3 MALONEY LAUERSDORF REINER, PC

4  
5 By /s/Andrew C. Lauersdorf  
6 Andrew C. Lauersdorf, WSBA #35418  
7 E-Mail: [acl@mlrlegalteam.com](mailto:acl@mlrlegalteam.com)  
8 Janis C. Puracal, WSBA #39234  
9 E-Mail: [jcp@mlrlegalteam.com](mailto:jcp@mlrlegalteam.com)

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff Perienne de Jaray  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26